

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on August 8, 2006, and the references cited therewith.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-7 and 10-28 stand rejected. Applicant notes with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in dependent claims 8 and 9. Applicant has not yet rewritten these claims in independent form because applicant submits that the independent claims are patentable for the reasons discussed below. Claims 1, 4, 7-11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 23, 25, 27 and 28 are amended. Claims 1-7 and 10-28 remain pending in this application.

35 USC §103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1 – 7 and 10 – 28 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2001/0025330 to OI et al. (“OI”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,651,058 to Hackett-Jones et al. (“Hackett-Jones”) and in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,051,116 to Rodriguez-Val et al. (“Rodriguez-Val”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In the Remarks filed with Amendment B on June 7, 2006, applicant argued that none of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest comparing a received packet data structure with a data structure for a known property management device. Applicant notes that the claims have been amended to clarify that a known property management device is a known type of property management device. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, in paragraph 0025 of the present application. The Office Action acknowledges that this limitation was not disclosed and now includes a new ground of rejection relying on a new reference, Rodriguez-Val, as teaching this limitation. In particular, the Office Action refers to column 9, lines 8-32 of Rodriguez-Val. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Rodriguez-Val discloses client identification when communicating through a network address translator device. As described in the Abstract of Rodriguez-Val, “[a] portion of the received data packet other than the nearest source address is examined for a host-assigned identifier that identifies a client device that communicated the received data packet.” The section of Rodriguez-Val referenced in the Office Action is referring to this process of using an

identifier to identify a client device. In particular, Rodriguez-Val states that a host system assigns “an identifier to at least one client device with which it communicates through a NAT device” (see col. 9, lines 8-11). Column 9 of Rodriguez-Val further states that “the host system examines a portion of the received data packet other than the nearest source address in an attempt to identify a host-assigned identifier of the client device that communicated the received data packet” (see col. 9, lines 24-28). Thus, the referenced section of Rodriguez-Val, as understood by applicant, merely discloses the identification of a particular client device using an identifier, not a comparison of a received packet data structure with data structures for types of known property management devices.

Independent claims 1, 11, and 14 have been amended to clarify that “determining if a device coupled to the communications port is a known type of property management device” is “based upon comparing the received packet data structure with a data structure for a known type of property management device.” Independent claims 19 and 25 recite that the device is determined to be a known type of property management device “if the data structure of the packet matches that for the known type of property management device.” Applicant respectfully submits that, even if the references could be combined in the manner proposed in the Office Action, the combination would not result in a method or system that compares a received packet data structure with a data structure for a known type of property management device and determines, based on that comparison (e.g., if the data structures match), if a device coupled to the communications port is a known type of property management device.

Moreover, as mentioned in the previous Remarks filed on June 7, 2006, OI fails to disclose determining whether a device is connected to a communications port of a messaging system because there is no mention of a messaging system in OI. The Office Action again refers to paragraph 0047 of OI; however, this paragraph, merely refers to an interface 14 provided with a plug and play function to detect plug status changes. At best, a combination of OI and Hackett-Jones might result in the use of a plug and play interface within the hotel interactive communication apparatus of Hackett-Jones. The Office Action provides no motivation to combine and modify these references such that a messaging system is integrated with a property management system in the manner recited in the claims of the present application.

Because the references, even if combined, fail to teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations recited in the independent claims 1, 11, 14, 19 and 25, applicant submits that these independent claims, and the claims dependent therefrom, would not have been obvious over OI in view of Hackett-Jones and further in view of Rodriguez-Val. Accordingly, applicant requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (603-668-6560) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2121.

Respectfully submitted,

JAMES M. COLEMON

By his Representatives,

Customer Number: 45459

Telephone Number: 603-668-6560

by: /Kevin J. Carroll/
Kevin J. Carroll
Reg. No. 36,384